

AN
ANALYSIS AND EXPOSURE
OF THE
NEW GOVERNMENT SCHEME
OF
EDUCATION;

SHOWING ITS PRECISE NATURE, ITS OBJECTIONABLE
CHARACTER, AND ITS MISCHIEVOUS TENDENCIES.

BY JOHN MIDDLETON HARE,

AUTHOR OF

"THE ANALYTICAL DIGEST OF SIR JAMES GRAHAM'S FACTORIES EDUCATION BILL."

LONDON:
JOHN SNOW, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1847.

Price One Shilling.

TYLER & REED,
PRINTERS,
BOLT-COURT, FLEET-STREET.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE new Government scheme of Education is an extremely objectionable and dangerous measure. So, doubtless, it will be regarded by the friends of civil and religious liberty, by the advocates of free and liberal education, and by Protestant Dissenters in particular, so soon as its real character and tendencies shall become known to them. My object, in the following pages, has been to assist in communicating this knowledge. I have, in the first place, endeavoured to present a clear, succinct, and exact description of the scheme, containing every point embraced in the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education in which it is developed, but methodised and abridged so as to exhibit more distinctly its precise nature, its scope and objects. Afterwards I have, under several heads, stated simply and briefly, point by point, the numerous grave objections to which the plan appears to me to be liable. The first thing to be accomplished is to diffuse abroad a just and intelligent apprecia-

tion of the measure; and then, by eloquent and indignant appeals to that love of liberty and independence which is the boast of Englishmen, to create the elements of a resolute, combined, and resistless opposition. To the former of these ends, which Mr. Edward Baines, junior, and others, have done so much to promote, I trust even these pages will in some degree contribute.

J. M. HARE.

TRIANGLE, HACKNEY,
Feb. 19, 1847.

THE NEW SCHEME

OF

GOVERNMENT EDUCATION.

THE new scheme of Government Education is developed in certain Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, dated in August and December, 1846, and which were presented to the Houses of Parliament, by her Majesty's command, on the 5th of February, 1847.

The proposed plan is based upon general resolutions adopted by the Committee on August 25, 1846.

These resolutions relate to—

1. The inspection of schools.
2. The appointment of school apprentices.
3. The qualification of schoolmasters.
4. The state of instruction in schools.
5. The proportion to be observed between local contributions and Government grants.
6. The selection of training masters.
7. Their recompense by annual grants.
8. The bestowment of retiring pensions on schoolmasters and mistresses.
9. The annual distribution of small gratuities to deserving schoolmasters.

of notes of a lesson on a subject selected by him ; elements of mechanics, or book-keeping ; syntax, etymology, and prosody ; the geography of the four quarters of the globe (girls, in the geography of the British Empire) ; outlines of English history ; their skill in managing and examining the second class in grammar, geography, and mental arithmetic.

Apprentices, at the end of the fourth year, are to be examined by the inspector in—the composition of an account of the organization of the school and the methods of instruction ; the first steps in mensuration, with practical illustrations, and elements of land-surveying, and levelling ; syntax, etymology, and prosody ; the geography of Great Britain, as connected with outlines of English history (girls, the four quarters of the globe) ; skill in managing and examining the first class in grammar, geography, and mental arithmetic, and in giving a lesson to two or three classes together.

Apprentices, at the end of the fifth year, are to be examined by the inspector in—the composition of an essay on the art of teaching ; the rudiments of algebra or practice of land-surveying and levelling ; syntax, etymology, and prosody ; the use of the globes, geography of the British empire and Europe, as connected with outlines of English history (girls, in the historical geography of Great Britain) ; ability to give a gallery lesson, and conduct the instruction of the first class in any subject selected by the inspector.

A knowledge of vocal music and of drawing, (especially from models,) though not absolutely required, will be much encouraged. Every appren-

tice will be required to be clean in person and dress. The number in any school will not exceed one to every 25 scholars ordinarily attending. At the close of each year, apprentices will be required to present certificates of good conduct from the managers of the school, and of punctuality, diligence, obedience, and attention to their duties, from the master or mistress. Every "pupil teacher" having passed the foregoing examinations, and presented the required testimonials in each year, will be entitled to a certificate declaring that he has successfully completed his apprenticeship.

Special provisions are made with regard to RELIGION and to the religious character of the schools in which apprentices are placed. These it is desirable to transcribe exactly from the Minutes.

As to candidates for apprenticeship,—“In schools connected with the Church of England, the clergyman and managers, and in other schools the managers, must certify that the moral character of the candidates and of their families justify an expectation that the instruction and training of the school will be seconded by their own efforts and by the example of their parents. If this cannot be certified of the family, the apprentice will be required to board in some approved household.

“In schools connected with the Church of England, they will be required to repeat the Catechism, and to show that they understand its meaning, and are acquainted with the outline of Scripture history. The parochial clergyman will assist in this part of the examination.

“In other schools, the state of the religious knowledge will be certified by the managers.”

Apprentices of one year's standing to be examined by the inspector,—“In the Holy Scriptures and in the Catechism, with illustrations by passages from Holy Writ, in Church of England schools—the parochial clergy assisting in the examination.

“The managers will in other schools certify in this and in the succeeding years of the apprenticeship, that they are satisfied with the state of the religious knowledge of the pupil-teachers.”

Of two years',—“In the Holy Scriptures, Liturgy, and Catechism, in Church of England schools, more fully than in the preceding year—the parochial clergyman assisting in the examination.”

Of three and four years',—“More fully in the Holy Scriptures,” &c.

Of five years',—“More *completely* in the Holy Scriptures,” &c.

“In Church of England schools the parochial clergyman, and in other schools the managers, will also certify that the pupil teachers or stipendiary monitors have been attentive to their religious duties.”

There are to be STIPENDIARY MONITORS, as well as apprentices or “pupil teachers,” because the masters and mistresses of schools in the rural districts are less competent to train teachers.

The Committee of Council, “desirous so to adapt their regulations to the condition of such schools, as by their improvement to enable them hereafter to provide for the training of pupil

teachers, are disposed, for a few years, to encourage the managers to retain their monitors, by small stipends, to the age of seventeen, without apprenticeship, but under a form of agreement with the parents, on condition that the master give each monitor extra daily instruction."

The regulations concerning stipendiary monitors so nearly resemble those affecting apprentices that it is needless to detail them. Those respecting religious knowledge are somewhat differently worded. Thus monitors of one year's standing are expected, "in Church of England schools, to show a general acquaintance with the Scriptures;" and those of two years' standing, "to give illustrations of the Catechism from the Bible."

Well-conducted apprentices and monitors are to receive the following *stipends*, irrespectively of any sum received from the school or any other source :

		Apprentice.	Monitor.
At the end of the 1st year	£10	0 0	£5 0 0
„ 2nd „	12	10 0	7 10 0
„ 3rd „	15	0 0	10 0 0
„ 4th „	17	10 0	12 10 0
„ 5th „	20	0 0	—

These stipends will be liable to be withdrawn on the report of the inspector, on proof of the continued ill-health of the apprentices or monitors, or of misconduct, want of punctuality, diligence, or skill, on failure in their examination, or in default of the required certificates.

Inspectors, in conjunction with principals of Normal Schools under inspection, are to submit to

the Lord President from among successful apprentices those who, upon competition in a public examination, to be annually held in each district, may be found most proficient in their studies and skilful in the art of teaching; and the Committee of Council will award, for as many as they may think fit, an EXHIBITION of 20*l.* or 25*l.* to one of the Normal Schools under inspection; such persons to be denominated “QUEEN’S SCHOLARS.” The exhibition is to be liable to be withdrawn, if the principal be dissatisfied with the conduct, attainments, or skill of the “Queen’s Scholars.” As further incentives to such as may not display the highest qualifications for the office of schoolmaster, but whose conduct and attainments may be satisfactory; opportunities are to be afforded of obtaining EMPLOYMENT IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

For the further ENCOURAGEMENT OF NORMAL TRAINING SCHOOLS, AND PERSONS UNDER TRAINING, the Committee of Council will award to every Normal School subject to inspection, a grant for every student trained therein, concerning whose character and conduct the principal shall give a favourable report, and concerning whose attainments, skill in teaching, and general aptitude for the vocation of a schoolmaster, it shall appear, at the close of each of the three years of training, that a certain standard of merit has been attained,—20*l.* at the close of the first year, 25*l.* of the second, and 30*l.* of the third.

The institution of DAY SCHOOLS OF INDUSTRY is to be promoted on the following conditions:

1. *School Field Gardens.*—If the Committee of

Council are satisfied with the position of the field in relation to the school, with the rent, the regulations, and the competency of the master, they will consider whether it may be expedient to make an annual grant not exceeding one-half the rent, so long as the inspector may report that the field is skilfully and industriously cultivated; to make a grant towards the purchase of tools in the first year; and to grant an annual gratuity to the master.

2. *Workshops for Trades.*—In schools situate in the denser parts of great cities, and intended to attract from the streets vagrant youths, if they are satisfied with the site, plan, and specifications, with the regulations, the master workmen, the share the scholars have in the produce of their labour, and the disposal of their work, they will consider the propriety of making grants for the erection of workshops, contribute towards the purchase of tools in the first year, and grant a gratuity to the master for every boy who shall have become a workman or assistant in any trade or craft, whereby he is earning his livelihood.

3. *School-kitchens and Washhouses.*—If their Lordships are satisfied with the site, plan, and specifications, with the competency of the school-mistress, and with the regulations, they will be disposed to make a grant towards the erection of the buildings, and grant a gratuity to the mistress, in every year in which the inspectors may report that the girls are successfully instructed in domestic economy.

In all cases, the schools shall be subject to inspection, and the general system of instruction be in conformity with the minutes by which the erection of school-buildings has hitherto been regulated.

With regard to the further ENCOURAGEMENT AND REMUNERATION OF SCHOOLMASTERS AND MISTRESSES, the regulations are as follows :

For the satisfactory training of apprentices and monitors, masters and mistresses are to be paid, at the close of each year,

For one apprentice, £5	For one monitor, £2 10s.
„ two „ 9	„ two „ 4 0
„ three „ 12	„ three „ 6 0
For each additional apprentice beyond three, 3 0	
For each additional monitor beyond three, 1 10	

If, in addition to other instruction, the male apprentice be skilfully trained in the culture of a garden, or in some mechanical art, or the female apprentice be instructed by the mistress in cutting out clothes, and in cooking, baking, or washing, and the inspector certify that they are thereby in a satisfactory course of training for the management of a school of industry, the master or mistress is to receive an additional gratuity, proportioned to the degree of skill and care displayed. The master is to give instruction in the prescribed subjects, during one hour and a half at least, on five days in the week, either before or after the usual hours of school-keeping.

The Committee of Council will further grant, in aid of the salary of every certificated schoolmaster

appointed to a school under their inspection, and who has had

	Per Annum.
1 year's training in a normal school under their inspection . . .	from £15 to £20
2 years'	£20 to £25
3 years'	£25 to £30

These grants are suspended on the conditions, that the trustees and managers of the school provide the master with a house, rent free, and a further salary equal at least to twice the amount of the grant; and annually certify that his character, conduct, and attention to his duties are satisfactory; and that the inspector report the school efficient. On the same conditions, schoolmistresses are to have two-thirds of the sums to be awarded to schoolmasters.

A retiring pension will be granted by the Committee of Council to any schoolmaster or mistress rendered incapable by age or infirmity, and who for fifteen years shall have conducted a normal or elementary school which shall have been under inspection seven years. The amount will be determined by the inspector's report, but will in no case exceed two-thirds of the average emoluments annually received by the applicant.

The scheme thus developed presents numerous points of grave objection. Instead of enlarging upon these, it may conduce to a clearer view and a distinct appreciation of the measure, if they be simply pointed out.

I. The first thing that strikes an attentive observer is the UNCONSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER of the mea-

sure. It appears to be unconstitutional in the following among other respects :—

Though perhaps more important in its bearings on the social, religious, political, and financial state of the kingdom, than any act of the Legislature since the Reform Act, it is introduced on the mere authority of a Committee appointed in 1839, for the limited purpose of administering a small annual grant in aid of school-buildings.

By it the Lord President of the Council, and those who act with him, assume authority to supersede altogether the functions of the Legislature.

The consequence is, that this measure, instead of being submitted to both Houses of Parliament in three several readings and a committal, like a Bill, will not be discussed at all, but will come under the notice of the Legislature only in the form of a proposal for augmenting the annual grant for the purposes of education.

There is nothing, however, to prevent those persons who object to it from petitioning Parliament against it.

Nor is there anything to prevent a Member sufficiently alive to its mischievous and unconstitutional character, from calling the attention of the House to the circumstances, and from raising the question, whether (although the Marquess of Lansdowne, in stating it to the House of Lords, observed that “ it did not lead to any conclusion which would require their Lordships’ sanction, and did not require, in order to give effect to it, any Bill to which the consent of the other House would be necessary,”) this, like any other new measure involving an outlay of

public money, must not be proceeded with, first by Resolution, and afterwards by Bill ; and not, as is now attempted, after the fashion of a French ordinance or a Russian ukase.

It will be something new, if a Minister who, being a Peer, is not even responsible to a constituency for his public acts, is to make such expensive and important edicts at pleasure, without being called to account. It is to be hoped, however, that some means will be found of reminding the noble Marquess, in his own words, when describing this insidious scheme, “ that there is in this country, *even in the very actions of the Government itself*, when interfering with the ordinary habits and arrangements of the people, that which excites opposition, jealousy, and *difficulty*, and *which it is not in the power of a Government constituted like ours effectually to counteract or to oppose.*”

II. This measure is as UNNECESSARY as it is unconstitutional ; and that for many reasons, of which the following are the chief :—

It is proposed at a time when more has been voluntarily done, or is in course of being attempted, for the education of the people, than at any former period ;

When schools and buildings are rapidly increasing in number ;

When large funds are being voluntarily raised for educational purposes ;

When nearly every religious denomination is engaged in special and unprecedented efforts ;

When new normal training schools are spontaneously springing up on every hand ;

When the quality of the instruction given in voluntary schools is confessedly improving ;

When the range of voluntary effort is embracing infants, children, and youth, and that of both sexes ; and,

When “ ragged schools ” have provided even for the vagrant and reputedly criminal juvenile population.

In 1818, there were, infant and daily scholars, 674,883 ; in 1833, 1,276,947 (or double). In 1818, there were Sunday scholars, 477,225 ; in 1833, 1,548,890 (or threefold). And this within fifteen years, during which there was no grant of public money for schools.

In twenty-eight years, the number of day scholars has been nearly trebled, being, in 1818, 674,883 ; in 1833, 1,276,947 ; in 1846, 1,876,947.

If already so many have, by voluntary means, been supplied with instruction, the probability (not to say certainty) is, that the same means will suffice for all.

It has been calculated, that, since 1818, upwards of 3,000,000*l.* sterling (exclusive of Government grants) has been expended in school-buildings.

Normal schools (indicating a self-prompted improvement in the quality of the instruction) have sprung up in considerable numbers, containing about 900 students, with accommodation for about 1,100 ; and many more have been projected.

“ When I add,” says Mr. Baines, “ the splendid effort making by the Free Church of Scotland to

build 700 or 800 schools ; the subscriptions raising for schools both by the Church and the Dissenters in Wales ; the schools established and the educational boards in operation among the Congregationalists and the Wesleyans ; the county educational associations formed in Essex, West Kent, Cambridgeshire, Devonshire, and Pembrokeshire ; the thirty ragged schools of London, with 3,000 scholars ; and the ragged schools formed in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Aberdeen, and other places ; the project of thirty infant schools in Birmingham ; the Rev. Mr. Burgess's project of fifty schools in a part of the metropolis ; and Mr. Baxter's proposal for church schools in Yorkshire—to which, doubtless, might be added many more unknown to me, as well as the formation of mechanics' institutions, athenæums, libraries, youths' guardian societies, &c., over the whole kingdom,—I appeal to your Lordship if there is not an effective zeal manifested in the cause of education, worthy of the reliance of an enlightened statesman."

The Wesleyans alone have forty students now in training at Glasgow ; are contemplating the immediate establishment of a training school of their own in London ; have set apart a special fund for this purpose of 20,000*l.* a year, besides an annual grant from the Conference ; are at present spending 20,000*l.* a year in support of 370 day schools, with 34,285 children ; are providing for the speedy erection and formation of better than 300 more ; are supporting 4,106 Sunday schools, with 80,998 teachers, and 436,299 scholars, at a yearly expense

of 25,000*l.* ; and have (mark that !) an inspector of their own body and appointment.

The Baptists, like the Friends and other small communities, are co-operating with the British and Foreign School Society.

The Congregationalists have pledged themselves to a special contribution for education, of 109,280*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.*, besides the maintenance of existing schools ; and, of 38,559*l.* 5*s.* 3*d.*, the cost of building and improving 147 school-rooms, they have in two years contributed 33,391*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.*

And they have done this in an unsectarian spirit ; for, as Mr. Ainslie, their intelligent and indefatigable secretary, justly observes, “the denominationalism of the Board has been *in raising the money*” merely.

The fair inference is, that those who have already done so much, will eventually do all they can.

Now, as to what they *can* do. From 1841 to 1845, inclusive, the Wesleyan, London, and Baptist Missionary Societies raised, for foreign missions alone, the sum of 1,103,497*l.*, and these three societies annually raise for the same purpose at least 200,000*l.*

Is not this an encouragement to hope, that the same parties will do equally great things for home, “as soon” (to quote Mr. Ainslie’s words) “as the education and evangelization of the neglected parts of England are felt to be as important and necessary as those of heathen countries ?”—a conviction that is manifestly growing in the public mind.

The defects recently complained of in the system

of teaching, whether in National or in British schools, imply by that very recency a redoubled zeal and diligence, which, instead of constituting an argument for Government interference, only goes to strengthen the proofs that it is unnecessary.

Misled by the reports of their inspectors, which take cognizance only or chiefly of Church of England schools, the Government suppose, according to Mr. Watkins's report, that the school attendance in Manchester, for example, is but one in sixty-three and-a-half of the whole population, when in fact, as Mr. Baines has shown, it is one in ten : and *ex uno disce omnes*.

It is easy, in this way, to get up a case of destitution, (however shameful to a Church receiving 6,000,000*l.* a-year for giving instruction to the people,) and so to invent a plea for reiterating the horse-leech cry of "Give, give!"

But, were the destitution in Manchester, or in all Lancashire, such as Mr. Watkins represents it, surely a county containing real property to the annual value of 7,105,248*l.* 10*s.* 4½*d.*, might easily supply the deficiency, without Government interference.

That the scheme is unnecessary, is virtually admitted by the Marquess of Lansdowne himself, who, after stating that "he fully felt that everything which Government could at present do would fall *infinitely short* of that which ought to be included in a general plan for improving the state and education of the people ;" added, nevertheless, that "he should almost despair of ultimate success, if from experience and observation he had not seen *the zeal*

upon the subject of education which pervaded all denominations of men in this country,—if he had not witnessed the unceasing zeal of the clergy in that branch of their duties,—if it had not come within his knowledge that scarcely a week elapsed without applications and representations reaching his hands which showed the steady and gradual mode in which the cause of education was advancing in every part of the country, while that most useful and respectable class of men, the schoolmasters, were improving their own condition, at the same time that they were advancing the best interests of their pupils. From all this, it was impossible for him to avoid indulging the most favourable anticipations.”

III. The scheme involves a VAST EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC MONEY.

There are no fewer than *fourteen several heads of expense.*

As no estimate accompanies the Minutes of Council, it is difficult to speak with exactness ; but, even though the first demand should not be very great, it will ultimately prove one of the heaviest items in the Budget ; and, once allowed, will be confirmed as an established thing, (like the Maynooth Grant,) to be augmented at pleasure, and passed without question.

On the rational assumption (adopted by Mr. Baines) that 15,000 schools, and as many schoolmasters, will eventually come under the operation of the scheme, it will by-and-by involve an annual expense of 1,742,500*l.* or more.

The reasonableness of this calculation is shown by the fact, that Dr. Hook reckoned the gross

expense of schools at 2,541,571*l.*, and that part that was to arise out of public funds at 1,141,571*l.*; while Mr. Kay put his claim for education at 2,500,000*l.*, and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett at 4,487,700*l.* a-year!

Mr. Ainslie (in his instructive pamphlet) has shown, that the Voluntaries can make a little money go much further than the Government can a great deal; in the article of Normal Schools, for instance.

IV. The scheme will establish an ALARMING AND UNEXAMPLED EXTENSION OF GOVERNMENT PATRONAGE.

Every public schoolmaster in the country is invited to become a candidate for grants, gratuities, apprentice fees, and, finally, a pension for life.

None of these, however, can be obtained without the favour of the Government for the time being.

Those who would obtain these benefits, must consequently be subservient to the Government.

And that subserviency must be *continued*, on pain of the withdrawal of the benefits.

The inspectors are armed with full powers to reward the submissive, check the presumptuous, and punish the refractory.

Suppose, with Mr. Baines, that a schoolmaster, or pupil, or monitor, should lose the favour of *one inspector*, such is the *centralizing* operation of the system, that he becomes at once equally obnoxious to *the whole staff of inspectors*, and is a ruined man, perhaps for life.

As to rewarding the submissive, the *liberal* character of the intentions of the framers was signi-

ificantly shadowed forth by the Marquess of Lansdowne, in the following words:—"They (schoolmasters) were men who were *placed in immediate contact with, and performing some of their duties in common with, the clergy* ; but, at the same time, while they took their full share in the performance of those duties, they received a most *inadequate amount of reward*. He did think that any extension of the system of education in this country would be imperfect, *which did not to a considerable extent ameliorate the condition of this class, and excite their hopes of reward*. It was therefore proposed that *a provision,—small, undoubtedly, at first*, but still which would be considered a very great object as a provision, however small, for old age,—should be made for well-conducted schoolmasters and schoolmistresses who should be reported as having for fifteen years conducted *unexceptionably* schools of a certain size."

The "pupil teachers," or apprentices, and the stipendiary monitors, are equally, or still more if possible, at the mercy of these potential overseers ; and, inasmuch as they will be of precisely the pliable age at which habits are formed, they will naturally grow up a subservient race,—slaves themselves, and, as such, not adapted to educate a generation of freemen.

It has been calculated by Mr. Baines, that 88,000 individuals, making, with their families, 396,000 souls, will thus be brought under direct Government influence.

To this compact army of Government functionaries, let there be added their relatives and friends ;

and the aspirants and expectants of office, with *their* families, relatives, and friends; and it becomes evident how fearfully the circle of Governmental influence will be extended by this insidious and mischievous measure.

Lord John Russell could not leave Lord George Bentinck a more acceptable legacy, should the Protectionist leader ever become his successor.

It is a measure more worthy of Louis Philippe and Guizot than of Queen Victoria and her Whig Premier.

Those who wish to trace the resemblance between this scheme and the French system are referred to a valuable work, entitled "France—her Governmental, Administrative, and Social Organization, exposed and considered in its Principles, in its Working, and in its Results." (Madden.)

In this volume, (of which a second edition has been demanded,) the nature, working, and effects of the French Government system of public instruction will be found clearly described in pages 40—44, and 182—189.

A few particulars may be here stated, which will suffice not only to show that the English Government scheme has been drawn from the French pattern, but also to indicate the fruits which such seeds may be expected to bear.

In the department of public instruction, there are 21,000 paid officials, receiving annually 13,000,000 francs; unpaid officials, deriving an income from their offices or monopolies, 22,000; exercising all the municipal powers under the Prefect, &c., 12,450; unemployed officials receiving gratuities,

annuities, *secours*, &c., 160 (to the amount of 80,000 francs) ; pensioners, retired officials, 1,200, receiving annually 870,000 francs : total officials, 56,810 ; salaries and pensions, 13,950,000 francs.

The Minister of Public Instruction has a general staff of eight councillors, receiving annually 10,000 francs each, and fourteen general inspectors, with a fixed salary of 6,000 francs each, besides their travelling expenses.

The inspectors of academies, whose number is indefinite, receive 3,000 francs a year, besides travelling expenses.

Eighty-seven inspectors of primary schools receive salaries of from 1,500 to 2,000 francs each.

Eighty-seven bureau clerks cost 293,000 francs annually.

All officials, inspectors, teachers, and others, are appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction, and can be suspended, removed from place to place, or dismissed, according to ministerial pleasure : "so that the 11,000 professors paid by the State are compelled to submit to the caprices of the Government, either to obtain promotion or to be maintained in their employment."

There are, in France, about 12,800 *private* schools, which, nevertheless, are as much, perhaps more, at the mercy of the Minister than the public schools.

They cannot be established without a license from the Minister, and they can be shut up by a simple ministerial order, which frequently happens.

The heads of such establishments cannot enter-

tain liberal opinions, express them, or vote in their support at elections, without exposure to complete ruin.

At the Normal School of Paris, young men, wishing to enter upon the career of public instruction, receive a complement of education at the expense of the State.

This school is "now nothing more than a political job."

There are about 2,000 *bourses* (bursaries or scholarships) with 600,000 francs, paid either by the State or by the departments, for poor scholars admitted on the appointment of the Minister.

Of these, M. Guizot and his successors in the office have made large political use, generally disposing of them in favour of the children of electors, or the relatives and dependants of Deputies, of their party.

By this means "200 Deputies have their sons, nephews, &c., educated at the public expense."

The system of education is entirely determined by the Minister.

Not only the books used in study, but also those the youths are allowed to read in their leisure, must be approved by the Minister; which "enables him to patronise certain authors and booksellers, who generally bribe some influential member of the Council to have their unsaleable books adopted."

The amount actually paid for distributing such books is no less than 400,000 francs.

M. Guizot, the great exemplar of our State-educationists, commenced this part of his career by putting down the freedom of public instruction

in the instance of a free school for poor children, opened by Count de Montalembert, who, with his associates, was indicted and fined.

The Marquess of Lansdowne has avowed his ambition to "put the population of this country, with respect to education, in that condition in which the populations of some parts of Europe are placed, *where an uneducated child is an almost solitary exception, and where, among the great mass of the people, education is universal.*"

We have the authority of the writer of the book from which we have been quoting for saying, that, if his Lordship referred to France, he is misinformed.

In that kingdom, notwithstanding its complete system of Government education, of many years' standing, "two-thirds of the population are in a state of gross ignorance; 17,000,000 are unable either to read or write; 7,000,000 can read but imperfectly, and cannot write; about 7,000,000 can read and write but imperfectly; and only 3,000,000 are properly and completely educated."

Until 1833, the primary schools, like our National and British schools, were private institutions under the patronage of the principal inhabitants, and the masters were independent of the Government.

It was M. Guizot who proposed and obtained a law by which all such schools were placed under the immediate control of his administration.

By this law such schools were fixed at 34,000, with an equal army of State schoolmasters, to be supported by a special communal tax.

Normal Schools were super-added, *to give uniformity to the method of instruction.*

M. Guizot next instituted *a fund of encouragement for primary instruction.*

The scheme was perfected under M. Guizot's friend and successor, Salvandi, who acted on the declared principle, that "authority had not a sufficient hold upon the great body of primary teachers, and that the only means of providing against so many *inconveniences* was by proceeding to a *complete, definitive, normal organization* of the department of public instruction."

"All despotic governments," says the honest and sagacious writer to whom England is indebted for these emphatic and timely warnings against following in the steps of France, "whatever may be their constitutional forms, autocratic, aristocratic, or oligarchic, claim the monopoly of public instruction. * * * * A rising generation, thus educated, must be fit only for ministering or submitting to any despotism, and for setting the example of servility and degradation to the uneducated classes of the people. That being the object of the Government, the monopoly of public instruction must necessarily be maintained, and form one of the ministerial departments. Similar was, in 1839, the object of Lord John Russell. Such is, in 1843, the object of Sir James Graham." And such, it may now be added, that of Lord John Russell's Government in 1847.

In fine, under this division of the subject, the proposed scheme is but one branch of that many-armed system of Government patronage, on which Whig and Tory seem alike to rely for repressing the

advances of democracy. The system is *not yet quite perfect* in England, but, in France,—

“Such,” says our author, “is the perfection of the system, that, in four or five days, at the utmost, the whole of their forces can be put in motion from one extreme point of the country to the other. The King enjoins a measure on one of his nine Ministers. That Minister sends his orders, by post or by the telegraph, to the Prefect, who is a king *au petit pied* in his department, and has for his ministers the heads of all the administrations under the several ministries, to whom he immediately transmits the order, commanding its immediate execution ; to the bishop of the department, if the order refers to ecclesiastical matters ; to the attorney-general, or the King’s attorney, if it relates to judiciary measures ; to the rector of the academy, if it concerns public instruction ; to the chief engineers of the *ponts et chaussées*, if it relates to the ministry of public works ; and in the same manner to the directors of direct or indirect taxes, of registry and domains, and of the post-offices. If any resistance occurs, or is apprehended, to the execution of the order, the Prefect enjoins the general commanding the department (his minister-at-war) to dispose the military forces, and employ them, in such a manner as to enforce submission, at any cost, to the obnoxious measure, and secure the domination of the rulers, or, as they call it, *l’ordre public* ; for public order is the undisturbed exercise of their authority.”

V. The GROSS PARTIALITY of the scheme, as between Dissenters of every name and the Established Church, is one of its most marked and revolting features.

It lays, in effect, the foundations of a SUBSIDIARY CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

As the published Minutes of the Committee of Council show, it has been brought forward *at the instance of clergymen and churchmen exclusively.*

The heads of the Church,—the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London,—have, in their places as peers, given to it their significant approbation.

The four new inspectors, and nearly all the others, are clergymen ; and the rest are understood to be churchmen.

In these circumstances, there can be no doubt that all the National schools will be on the list of Government recipients.

The parochial clergy are to attend, and assist in every examination.

Their yearly certificates are indispensable to both pupil teachers and stipendiary monitors.

Thus the whole school staff,—masters, apprentices, and monitors,—will be as much dependent on the parochial clergy as on the inspectors and the Committee of Council themselves.

Think of 12,000 clergymen exercising this new and vast influence in their respective parishes. May we not fairly infer the manner in which they will use it from the manner in which they have used the influence which they previously possessed ?

In all the Church of England schools, the teaching

of religion is enforced and defined, and the Church Catechism recognised as one of the standards of religious knowledge ; and no child will be allowed to have the benefit of tuition in those schools who will not learn the Catechism and attend Church on Sundays.

Even the inspectors are as much, or more, under the authority of the Church, as under that of the civil Government.

The Archbishops, indeed, have them completely under their control.

Their Graces must be consulted by the Committee of Council, each with regard to his own province ; and no inspector can be appointed without their concurrence.

Their appointment is during pleasure : the Archbishop of each province can withdraw his concurrence, and from that moment the authority of the inspector ceases.

The inspectors receive their instructions " with regard to religious teaching " from the Archbishops, and also send a copy to the Bishop of the diocese for his information.

Thus (as the National Society observe, in a Resolution commemorative of their success in obtaining these privileges) the inspection is " derived from and connected with the authorities of the National Church."

Nearly all the grants under the scheme will, it is obvious, be received by the Church.

It is, in effect, a measure for the universal inculcation of the pernicious doctrines of the Church Catechism on the minds of the young.

VI. From what has preceded, it is clear that the scheme MOST INJURIOUSLY AFFECTS DISSENTERS ; and that in numerous ways.

It will compel Dissenters, as contributors to the general taxation, to pay for religious teaching under the exclusive direction and control of the Established Clergy.

It is, in point of fact, a new law, or rather a new *edict*, to compel Wesleyans, Quakers, and all other Nonconformists, to make new payments, additional to tithes, church-rates, Easter offerings, &c., for the teaching of doctrines they disbelieve, and the maintenance of a system they hold to be unscriptural.

It will operate as a heavy blow and great discouragement to all schools established by Dissenters, Sunday and week-day.

As the authors of the measure must be well aware, its ostensible impartiality goes for nothing, so far as the Dissenters are concerned.

Those of them, at least, who consistently hold the Voluntary Principle, cannot become recipients of the public money.

The Marquess of Lansdowne alleged the scruples of Voluntaries as one reason why a more complete system of Government Education has not been introduced.

Those schoolmasters who are consistent Dissenters, are placed at an unjust disadvantage.

To others less scrupulous, lures are held out, to induce them to abandon Dissenting schools.

The best class of scholars are similarly lured by the various advantages held out in apprenticeships, monitorships, Queen's scholarships, appointments

in the Excise and Customs, school-gardens, workshops, kitchens, and washhouses.

Dissenting school committees are insultingly tempted to betray their principles for the sake of clutching public money.

Subscribers may be influenced to suspend their subscriptions—some under pretence that Government grants ought to be accepted; some, perhaps, because they may actually be accepted.

While the scheme has these tendencies, it also compels the poorer section of the community (the Dissenters) to support the schools and the religion of the richer (the Established Church), at the same time undermining and destroying the schools which the former are struggling to support.

Dissenters are not, indeed, mentioned by name, but they are *struck at* with a fearful reality.

This is the more unjust and cruel, the Whigs and their underlings having good reason to know, (as Mr. Ainslie has justly remarked,) how deeply some Protestant Dissenters feel, that, in coveting Government money for teaching religion, whether in schools or chapels, at home or in the colonies, they have committed a fatal error, which they are not disposed to aggravate by repeating.

They are now sensible, that by accepting grants for themselves, they should be yielding a tacit sanction to all grants made for teaching religion, including those to Church of England schools, “where,” to use Mr. Ainslie’s words, “the Church Catechism is made a test, and where compulsion enforces attendance on the Lord’s day, or penalty prohibits week-day instruction.”

Even those Dissenters who formerly deceived themselves with the transparent fallacy of accepting Government money on the unconstitutional and unreasonable principle of non-interference, are now cut off by the rule which makes a rigorous and tyrannical inspection the *sine quâ non* of the original and continuous reception of pecuniary benefit.

Nor can it be supposed, that those who have accustomed themselves to regard a Government *system* as dangerous, but Government *grants* as innocuous, will, now that they are fully informed as to the intentions of the Government, remain under that delusion, even though they should still fail to perceive, that a *system* would do no more than *perfect* the *invasion of principle* to which the recipients of *grants* had already lent themselves.

Besides, it is a pleasing fact, that the Congregational Board of Education systematically withholds its aid from schools by which Government money has been taken.

In fine, under this head, this measure aggravates the burdens of Dissenters, imposes on them new disabilities, places them under inequitable disadvantages, and aims insidiously at the destruction of their educational institutions, by increasing, at their expense, the attractiveness of Church of England schools, and by rendering attendance on their Sunday-schools an act to be followed, in many instances, with practically penal consequences.

VII. After what has been already stated, it seems almost superfluous to add, that the measure is as

HOSTILE TO CIVIL FREEDOM as to religious liberty ; and yet it may be well to establish this in a few special propositions which cannot be successfully disputed.

In its hostility to Dissenters, its hostility to general freedom is clearly manifest.

The Dissenters were the fathers of freedom in this country ; and whatever injuriously affects them, may safely be construed into a deadly attack on public liberty.

For they who make a stand for liberty of conscience, are lifted above those sordid and secular considerations which often overbear the love of freedom in other minds.

The plausible pretensions of a centralizing Governmental system may captivate, as they have captivated, the minds of political liberals so called ; but they can never conquer that inherent love of individual freedom and personal independence which characterises the conscientious and well-instructed Protestant Dissenter, although his rights be invaded and his person trampled in the dust.

The system of inspection which this measure institutes, will be fatal, unless timely checked, to liberty.

Institutes, we say, because, while the former system of inspection was confined to schools, this extends, for the first time in this country, to PERSONS, over whom it establishes a *surveillance* marked with the worst features of the police tyranny and espionage that have been exercised under the most grinding foreign despotisms.

The inspectors (at an average annual expense

of £850 each,) are wholly dependent upon the Government, and are amenable to no forms of constitutional responsibility.

All schools, schoolmasters, pupil teachers, and stipendiary monitors, are placed entirely at their mercy, and subject to their unlimited control.

The scheme aims a dangerous blow at civil freedom, because it invades freedom of education, which is essential to civil freedom.

It takes out of the hands of the people the conduct of their own education,—a self-educated people being the only people that can be expected to possess that *self-reliance* which is the noblest attribute of nations, and the best guarantee for their prosperity and freedom.

It exposes the rural population especially more than ever to clerical tyranny, giving its unqualified countenance to Church of England schools, in which no child can be taught who will not learn the Church Catechism and go to church.

It is also a violation of the first principles of freedom to appropriate money contributed by all denominations indiscriminately, to the exclusive support of the schools of one denomination,—schools, moreover, not free to all the children of the poor, without the imposition of a particular creed, and attendance upon a particular place of worship.



VIII. It has now been shown, by many considerations, that this measure is grossly UNCONSTITUTIONAL,

altogether UNNECESSARY, prodigally EXPENSIVE, involves a large extension of GOVERNMENT PATRONAGE, is EXCLUSIVELY IN FAVOUR OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, is MOST INJURIOUS AND UNJUST TOWARDS DISSENTERS, and seriously THREATENS OUR CIVIL AS WELL AS OUR RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES.

In considering these points, it has been made abundantly manifest, that the measure is largely fraught with *mischief* and *danger*, and impressed with the distinguishing and hateful features of *misgovernment*, *tyranny*, and *despotism* ; and that, by a system of rigorous *espionage* on the one hand, and a *corrupting* scheme of skilfully combined *bribes* on the other, it aims to bring the masses of the people under a hopeless yoke of *servility* and *subjection*.

Many other arguments and objections suggest themselves, which, although not ranging precisely under any of the heads already treated of, are not unworthy of attention from either the supporters or the opponents of the measure. Among them, are the following :

The scheme appears to have originated with a set of intriguing Education quacks, who have contrived to gain the ear of the Government for the time being, be it Whig or Tory ; and, while evidently sprung from the same parentage as Sir James Graham's Factories Education Bill, it is, if possible, a bolder, though a more insidious attack upon civil and religious freedom than even that audacious attempt.

It holds out inducements to all the schools and schoolmasters in the country to place themselves under Government inspection and control.

The Marquess of Lansdowne has stated that 3,500 schools, containing accommodation for 150,000 scholars, have already invited inspection.

It aims a destructive blow at every school the master and managers of which may prefer retaining their independence.

It is a direct discouragement of all schools and schoolmasters depending by choice or from principle on voluntary support.

Its ultimate effect will be to place in the hands of the Government the direction, superintendence, and control of the education of the country.

It is avowed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to be the wish of the Government to "put the population of this country, with respect to education, in that condition in which the population of some parts of Europe are placed."

Though not a perfect plan of this sort, it contains the germ of such a plan, and must lead, unless checked, to the same results.

It assumes that Governments are the best of educators, although its noble propounder has himself declared it to be "universally admitted that Governments are the worst of cultivators, the worst of manufacturers, and the worst of traders."

It further assumes, by necessary consequence, that Governments are the best educators, not only in schools, but also through the pulpit and the press,—a claim which, if admitted and acted upon, would, as has been observed, complete the destruction of public liberty.

But is the Government the best educator?

Let an Established Church, for three centuries

in undisturbed possession of enormous revenues, answer.

Let the Metropolitan Police, costing upwards of 400,000*l.* a year, declare.

Let the Model Prison at Pentonville, built at an expense of more than 200,000*l.*, and costing little less than 16,000*l.* a year, further answer this question.

Let the cost of "Justice," as reported in the Balance-sheet for 1845, containing the items of the Courts, Prosecutions, and Correction, amounting, exclusive of county prisons and gaols, and of county Police-rates, to the frightful sum of 1,557,756*l.*, repeat the answer.

Let 238,595*l.* expended in 1845 on convicts alone, add its voice.

Let 7,000,000*l.* collected in poor-rates also declare whether Government has *taught* the people to any good purpose.

But to take a few more specific answers to the important question.

"Look," says Mr. Ainslie (a high authority on such matters), "at Westminster: there is the Cathedral, but under its shadow for many years has been the vilest population in the metropolis. Have the clergy of the cathedral brought about a change? We are prepared to prove, that the labours of the City Missionaries, the erection of Westminster Chapel, the establishment of schools without Government aid, the indefatigable and exemplary labours of the Rev. Mr. Martin, the establishment of the Ragged School, the personal attention of Charles Hindley, Esq., M.P., to the prosperity

of the schools, the exertions of Mr. George Wilson in every good work, have accomplished greater good for the social improvement and happiness of the humbler classes in that locality,—for their instruction, evangelization, and advancement in society,—than the Abbey, with all its clergy and revenues, has done for the last century.”

Did “the best educator” set up Ragged Schools?

“A stable,” says Mr. Ainslie, still speaking of voluntary effort under the shade and within the precincts of Westminster Abbey; “a stable was taken and converted into a school-room, and was first opened as a Sunday-school, in February, 1839; and as a Day-school, in December of the same year. The locality (Pie-street) was notoriously bad, and the children very numerous, and all being trained up in vice and crime. Two thousand five hundred and eleven children have passed through the school since it was established, and *not one has been known to have been taken, even before a magistrate*; whereas 18 boys had been transported, before the school was opened, from families some of whose children are now attending the school.

“One man, probably the most noted thief in Westminster, brought his boy to Mr. Walker, (the founder of this first of Ragged Schools, though without the name,) a lad of 13 years of age, who did not know a letter in the alphabet, and said, ‘Here, Mr. Walker, I have brought you my boy; he has got a drunken mother, and I cannot bear to see him trained up as a thief.’ This boy was the first for the new school; and Mr. Walker took charge of him, and the boy has conducted himself

with propriety for two months. The father's account of himself was as follows: 'My father died when I was a child, leaving my mother with a family. One day I was playing in the streets with some boys, tossing buttons, and one of the boys accidentally broke a window; we all ran off, a policeman took me, swore that I did it, and I was committed to Brixton for three months, and was in a cell with two other boys, who taught me thieving. *I never should have been a thief, if I had not been sent to Brixton.*' This man has promised to help in getting the worst boys into the school, and to aid it to the utmost of his power.

"A second boy, the child of a widow, who could do nothing with him, has, at the request of the mother, been admitted, and is doing well. Mr. Walker asked the policeman if he knew the boy as a thief, and if he had been in prison. The policeman replied, 'Yes, I know him, and *he has been in prison as often as he has got teeth in his head.*'

"Four thieves (well dressed) went in, a short time back, to see the new school. The master did not know them, and thought they were four gentlemen who had come as visitors. After minutely observing everything, one of them said, and the rest concurred in it, 'Would to God such places had been opened years ago, and *hundreds would have been saved from ruin.*' Mr. Walker, having heard of these visitors, and finding that some of the boys knew them, inquired who they were, and found them to be four thieves whom he had long known in the neighbourhood. Mr. Walker's kindness to this class of persons, and his efforts to improve

them and do them good, have won their hearts, and any of them would serve him night or day to the extent of their power."

Thirty-two of these schools now exist in London alone, "a Ragged School Union" has been formed, and Lord Ashley, not the Marquess of Lansdowne, is its Lord President.

And what thinks Lord Ashley of the adaptation of "the best educator" to manage these Ragged Schools, the latest invention, the *ne plus ultra*, one would think, of educational benevolence? Mr. Ainslie shall say:—"Some of the Committee of the 'Ragged School Union' have been casting a lingering eye towards Government aid; and ventured to suggest, in the presence of Lord Ashley, the taking of it; when his Lordship said to this effect, 'I can, for such an object as this, obtain for you, I have no doubt, any reasonable amount from the Government; but after the money comes the inspector. *He will not approve of the kind of agents carrying on the work; he will find fault with what you think to be right; and the plan, as now worked, will fail.*' It is the HEART, embodied in the agency, that gives a living reality to the work."

It contains the germinating principle of bringing the teachers of all religions, however opposite, into connection with the State, and offering to all State-pay; for no inquiry is to be instituted into the teaching which may pass for religion, in any but Church of England schools; but the pecuniary benefits of the measure are offered to all who will accept of them, without question on this head.

It may be said, indeed, that the grants in aid cannot

be obtained unless the managers of the school contribute in a certain proportion, and that they will therefore be a beneficial stimulus to voluntary exertion; but they may and will operate reversely: for some, at least, will be found averse from encouraging masters to render themselves subservient to the powers that be.

Where already the subscribers raise more than the required sum, the Government grants will be a positive discouragement to private liberality.

Finally, (*and this deserves the most serious consideration,*) this wily scheme seeks to set aside the masculine and independent race of teachers, for whom we are indebted to the Borough-road and other similar establishments, and to substitute in their stead a boyish generation of instructors, who, entering upon a course of training for this purpose at the early age of thirteen years, and being under a certain discipline for five years, with annual examinations by the Government Inspectors and the Established Clergy, shall, though at the end of their course not more than eighteen, or it may be in some cases twenty years of age, be found the pliant and unreluctant tools of political and ecclesiastical authority.



